

## NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Hall	Oberstar
Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Alexander	Hill	Olver
Allen	Hinchey	Ortiz
Andrews	Hinojosa	Pallone
Baca	Hoeffel	Pascarell
Baird	Holden	Pastor
Baldwin	Holt	Payne
Ballance	Honda	Pelosi
Becerra	Hooley (OR)	Peterson (MN)
Bell	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berkley	Inslee	Price (NC)
Berman	Israel	Rahall
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Bishop (NY)	(TX)	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Ross
Boswell	John	Rothman
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Boyd	Jones (OH)	Ruppersberger
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Capps	Kildee	Sanchez, Linda
Capuano	Kilpatrick	T.
Cardin	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Klecza	Sanders
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	Sandlin
Carson (OK)	Lampson	Schakowsky
Case	Langevin	Schiff
Clay	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Lee
Cooper	Lee	Serrano
Costello	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cummings	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Snyder
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Solis
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Spratt
Davis (TN)	Majette	Stark
DeFazio	Maloney	Stenholm
DeGette	Markey	Strickland
Delahunt	Marshall	Stupak
DeLauro	Matheson	Tanner
Deutsch	Matsui	Tauscher
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Dooley (CA)	McDermott	Tierney
Doyle	McGovern	Towns
Emanuel	McIntyre	Turner (TX)
Engel	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Farr	Menendez	Visclosky
Fattah	Michaud	Waters
Filner	Miller (NC)	Watson
Ford	Miller, George	Watt
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Waxman
Frost	Moore	Weiner
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gordon	Murtha	Woolsey
Green (TX)	Nadler	Wu
Grijalva	Napolitano	Wynn
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	

## NOT VOTING—11

Ballenger	Gephardt	Janklow
Cramer	Gibbons	Millender-
Edwards	Goss	McDonald
Fossella	Harman	Owens

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1739

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. WEINER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

# IMPACT OF UPCOMING VOTE ON RULE ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak out of order so that the gentleman from Florida and I might be allowed to explain a procedural matter before the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that Members who were not on the floor for an earlier discussion not be mouse-trapped on the coming vote. I think it is important for them to understand the following, and I want to ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) whether this is correct.

It is my understanding that a vote for the rule on the legislative branch appropriations bill will enable Members to express their desire that the previous provision which was discussed on the floor in the earlier vote, which would have had the effect of expanding dental care for Members of Congress and our staffs, will be eliminated from that bill. So if Members want to be on record opposed to that proposition, they will need to vote "yes" on the rule.

I would ask the gentleman from Florida if that understanding is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly correct. We made a correction that was necessary; and as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) when he presented the rule acknowledged, we agree with that. A vote for the rule not only passes the rule, but it also eliminates the matter that we were concerned about.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was on the floor when this happened and knows that we tried to explain at the time that the amendment to the rule was effectively a striking amendment that said that, if the rule passes as amended, in no way will any expansion of vision or dental benefits occur.

The gentleman made it very clear he would not mind debating that on the floor of the House and having an open discussion of it and maybe passing an expansion of vision and dental benefits, but to pass this rule as amended would allow us not to sneak it in. So to pass this rule as amended is a striking amendment to prohibit any expansion of benefits without a vote by the House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. As has been described by the two previous speakers, I want to frame very quickly one side of this that I think we need to discuss.

Someone asked who put this in, that they ought to be fired. I did it. Now, anyone that can fire me, there are some 600,000 people in the 18th congressional district, so I want to make that clear. This has transcended about a year and a half period of time.

□ 1745

I want to frame the argument here, and that is that it extends to the full staff, Democrat and Republican or Independent or Natural Law Party or whatever they are, of the entire House.

Now, when I say that, I would argue to anybody in this country that the staff of this House on either side of the aisle are not second-class citizens of this country, and they have the right to dental and eye vision as any other person, and I hope we can take care of the entire country that way. But to single out the staff of the U.S. House, as we have for a period of years, I do not think is fair. I hope down the line we can discuss this.

Now, as far as someone not knowing what went where, this was not done at midnight, I discussed this, I brought it forth. So there are some misunderstandings, and I accept that, but I hope that we can also, in the calmness of debate on this down the road, realize that our people have every right to some type of benefit, and they have children, and they have families. And again, I hope we can help the entire country also, but let us not penalize the U.S. House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for those comments. I would simply point out that as was pointed out on both sides of the aisle, the issue was not whether our staff should have those benefits or that we should have those benefits; I want every American to have those benefits. The issue is whether or not that provision should be slipped into this bill without the knowledge of the Committee on Appropriations on either side of the aisle, without any single Member of this House, except the Member who just spoke, knowing about it, evidently. We simply did not want Members to wake up after they have voted for this bill to find out that they were going to be subjected to a 30-second TV spot because something had been slipped into the bill. Not a single reference was made in the budget justifications to this item.

So the point that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and I were making is not that this benefit should not be provided. It should not be provided without Members of Congress knowing what it is they are voting on, and it should not be provided without open, public debate.

